

City of Burien, Washington

Shoreline Advisory Committee

Meeting #2 Summary

June 11, 2008

4:00pm

(1) ATTENDANCE

SAC Members present	Technical Staff Present	Interested Parties Present
Brian Bennett Bruce Berglund Jim Branson Cyrilla Cook Joe Fitzgobbon Bob Fritzen Victoria Hall David Johanson Rebecca McInteer Emelie McNett Lee Moyer Kim Otto Annie Phillips Scott Thomas Don Warren Joe Weiss George Yocum	Mark Daniel Liz Ockwell	

Brian Bennett opened the meeting at 4:05pm.

(2) CONFIRM AGENDA

The agenda was confirmed.

(3) REVIEW AND APPROVE MEETING #1 SUMMARY

The committee was asked if there were any changes to the meeting summary as presented. Emelie McNett noted that her name was missing from the member's present section. The meeting summary was accepted with that correction.

(4) OPEN HOUSE DEBRIEF

1. Each member was provided an opportunity to comment on the Open House meeting held on May 14th. The following comments were provided.

§ It is hard to accurately summarize brief statements provided in discussion groups

§ The Shoreline Advisory Committee will fill in the discussion gaps that were not covered at the open house

§ Disappointed that the tone of the discussion groups was self-serving

- § Need for more inland resident representation— meeting attendance was out of balance
- § The committee should listen to all comments
- § There is an appreciation of comments from those who live east of 1st Avenue
- § Public trust doctrine and its implications on walking on private beach property, currently unresolved by Washington courts
- § It is good that people are engaged and issues are being raised now

2. SAC Comments:

- § A reminder that committee group discussions on shoreline topics should take place at our meetings, which are open to the public. Comments are encouraged and all e-mail comments should be submitted to David Johanson according to committee policy – he will then distribute them to the group.

(5) SHORELINE GOALS AND POLICIES, DISCUSSION

1. 2.13 Shoreline Element overview

- § Introduction section to provide background Information and technical terms used through out the element

2. 2.13.2 Shoreline Master Program Goals and Policies Applicable to All Elements

- § RE: PS 1.1, “Private property issues to be protected through this plan”
 - Discussion on the pros and cons to both include and exclude a statement regarding private vs. public use issues in the SMP
 - *Potential policy:* Private use and enjoyment of tidelands and adjacent lands should be balanced with the greater public benefit that shorelines provide
- § RE: PS 3.1, “Concern that regulation will be applied “generally” not on a site specific basis”
 - Policy language should be included
 - Could be combined with P.S. 2.1, “We don’t want DOE to regulate every aspect of our life”
 - *Potential policy:* When regulations are developed and applied they should consider site specific characteristics.
- § RE: PS 3.3, “Proactive management of activities within the 200’”
 - *Potential Policy:* The city should be proactive in managing activities within the shoreline jurisdiction
- § *Consensus* that there should be a section that includes goals and policies that apply to all elements

3. 2.13.3 Shoreline Master Program Coordination Element

§ RE: (LB 1) What is the Shore club

- Non-profit group on Lake Burien
- Lake residents attempt to police themselves and monitor lake health

§ Should have policy language recognizing existence of other plans and coordination opportunities where applicable

§ *Consensus* that a separate coordination element may not be needed but include in section 2.13.2 (Goals and Policies that apply to all elements).

4. 2.13.4 Shoreline Master Program Economic Development Element

§ Waterfront is an community amenity and asset that could attract businesses and residents to Burien

§ Development near shoreline?

- Small scale, water related commercial development may be allowed but should be harmonious with residential character
- Carefully craft vision for future commercial development
- *Consensus*: on Other Goal 1, “Insure healthy, orderly economic growth by allowing those economic activities which will be an asset to the local economy and which result in the least possible adverse effect on the quality of the shoreline and surrounding environment (and residential character)”

§ Discussion on definition of redevelopment

- How should nonconforming situations be addressed
- *Consensus*: There should be incentives available to encourage removal and/or reductions of non-conformances

§ *Consensus* supporting Other Policy 1, “New development or redevelopment should avoid or mitigate additional loss of shoreline ecological functions” and Other Policy 2, “Development on shorelines should result in no net loss of ecological function. Redevelopment should be encouraged to improve ecological functions and restore riparian buffers.”

- City should provide education and technical assistance on low-impact development techniques

5. 2.13.5 Shoreline Master Program Public Access Element

§ *Consensus*: Enforcement related goals and policies should be moved to the section applying to all elements

§ Street ends:

- Should have parking available at street ends
- There are impacts to beach and adjacent owners by disrespectful users, how do we enforce?

- Access points should be made ADA accessible
 - Parking and street end development should be compatible with surrounding community
 - Need for proper and maintained signage (parking, access identification)
 - Other modes of transportation should be accommodated at street ends
 - Street ends abut beach at:
 - a. 163rd -street sign is missing and hard to find
 - b. 170th - often used by windsurfers, kite-boarders
 - c. 172nd - often used by divers. No delineated parking area.
 - Existing Burien policies 1, 2 and 3 cover many of the issues and opportunities raised regarding street ends
- § RE: Other Policies 16, preference for this language
 “Promote a coordinated system of connected pathways, sidewalks, passageways between buildings, beach walks, and shoreline access points that increase the amount and diversity of opportunities for walking and chances for personal discoveries,” Burien has a bike/pedestrian plan.

(6) NEXT MEETING

1. There was *consensus* that there should be another meeting to continue the discussion on the goals and policies. The end of July was preferred. David Johanson will look at the calendar to find a date and coordinate possible dates with the committee.

The meeting concluded at 6pm.